

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed this Application in light of the first Office Action mailed March 28, 2000. Claims 1-63 are presently pending. Claims 1-10, 13-16, 20-23, 32, 33, 35, 38-40, 42 and 58-63 stand rejected. Claims 11, 12, 17-19, 24-31, 34, 36, 37, 41 and 43-57 stand allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 11, 12, 17-19, 24-31, 34, 36, 37, 41 and 43-57 if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request to defer rewriting these claims into independent form until the remarks in this Response are addressed by the Examiner.

Applicants thank the Examiner for faxing the omitted pages of the present Office Action to Applicants on November 11, 2000, in response to Applicants' telephonic request for the omitted pages on November 8, 2000. Applicants note that no page 15 was provided by the Examiner and that the page numbers indicate a further missing page between pages 14 and 16; however, the paragraph numbering on pages 14 and 16 is consecutive which indicates that page 15 may not exist. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner to clarify by providing the omitted page 15 if such a page exists or indicating that no page numbered 15 exists.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 16, 20, 23 and 63 as being anticipated by Knudson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,765,140 ("Knudson"). Of these, Claims 1 and 63 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131.

Knudson discloses a dynamic project management system that includes a server network and a master database. The network may be configured for translating a project plan including a plurality of tasks to be performed by users of the network into the master database to affect an assignments table. Knudson, Abstract. The assignments table includes a list of project tasks assigned for completion by each of the users. Knudson, Abstract. Knudson further discusses that project managers may periodically track and control project progress in

accordance with "the previously defined time schedules." Knudson, col. 7, lines 40 – 46. This project progress is tracked by using a list of project tasks assigned for completion in an assignments table in the master database. Knudson, col. 6, lines 4 – 11. The assignments table lists "assigned tasks for one or more projects for each of the identified users". Knudson, col. 6, lines 12 – 14. Knudson further describes the assignments table as being used "for assigning project tasks to users identified by their user profiles, which may be updated to "adjust assigned tasks and time schedules as required for the various identified users". Knudson, col. 6, lines 31 – 32; col. 7, lines 40 – 47.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system." The cited portions of Knudson do not teach or suggest this element of Claim 1. The cited portions of Knudson discuss translating a project plan into a master database to effect an assignments table which includes a list of project tasks assigned for completion, preparing time sheets which include project tasks and time records, and revising a project plan based on progress in meeting time schedules and labor costs. Knudson, col. 11, lines 38-40, col. 12, lines 1-7 and lines 20-23. Translating a project plan into a master database which effects an assignments table does not teach or suggest "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" because a project plan is not a "milestone" and a master database is not "tactics." For example, a milestone may be a term that is used to measure progress and is evidenced by quantifiable and verifiable deliverables. See specification, page. 14. For another example, a tactic may be a strategy or approach taken in the project to affect change. See specification, page. 14. It should be noted that milestones and tactics may include other and/or further elements as claimed and the above examples are for illustrative purposes only. Knudson does not teach or suggest "milestones" or "tactics", nor has the Examiner shown how Knudson teaches "milestones" or "tactics."

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has not changed the Examiner's discussion of the rejection of Claim 1 from the previous Office Action to the present Office Action except to change the quotation of Applicants' Claim 1 in the Office Action to include the elements added by Applicants' amendment to Claim 1 in Applicants' previous Response mailed June 27, 2000. The Examiner has provided no discussion or analysis as to how the cited reference of Knudson teaches Claim 1 as amended in Applicants' previous Response. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner respond Applicants' arguments so as to advance prosecution.

Therefore, Knudson does not teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 1. For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference of Knudson and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 1.

Independent Claim 63 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1. For example, Claim 63 recites "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system." For at least the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1, Claim 63 is patentable over the cited reference of Knudson.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-8, 16, 20 and 23, which depend from independent Claim 1, are patentable over Knudson for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and as defining further limitations over the cited reference.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed any of Applicants' previous arguments regarding the improper combination of references made by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner respond to Applicants' arguments regarding the combination of references as set forth in Applicants' previous Response mailed June 27, 2000 so as to advance prosecution of this case.

According to the MPEP:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

Dependent Claim 3 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Gary Hamel et al., *THE E-CORPORATION: More than just Web-based, it's building a new industrial order*. ("Gary Hamel"). Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that dependent Claim 3 is allowable as depending from independent Claim 1, shown above to be allowable, and as defining further limitations over the cited references of Knudson and Gary Hamel. Gary Hamel discusses the author's views of expectations that will "reverberate throughout the economy, affecting every business in eight major ways." Gary Hamel, p. 82. The portions cited by the Examiner discuss merely that "a real E-corp isn't just using the Internet to alter its approach to markets and customers; it's combining computers, the Web, and the massively complex programs known as enterprise software to change *everything* about how it operates." Gary Hamel, p. 82. However, the "eight major ways" discussed by the author address different problems than the ones Applicants are trying to solve – the "eight major ways" include topics entitled "When Push Comes to Suck", "Just the Plain Truth", "As You Like It", "Everything's an Auction", "The End of Geography", "Search Economies Rule", "My Place, My Time", and "Word of Mouse." Gary Hamel, pp. 82-91. These topics discuss Internet issues from a viewpoint such as consumer needs or distribution economies, issues not addressed by either Knudson or Applicants' invention. In fact, the author states that "Any company that denies consumers convenience and value to protect an entrenched channel is fighting history: Consumers will not be denied." Gary Hamel, p. 92. Gary Hamel does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" as recited by Claim 1, nor is Gary Hamel relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore, Claim 3 is allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Claim 3 be allowed.

Dependent Claims 9, 13 and 14 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Bates William, *Improving project management: better project management begins with a project management office*. ("Bates William"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that dependent Claims 9, 13 and 14 are allowable as depending from independent Claim 1, shown above to be allowable, and as defining further limitations over the cited references of Knudson and Bates William. Bates William is a three-page article that discusses the concept of establishing a project management office (PMO). The article discusses, for example, in four bulleted points the roles and functions of a PMO that depend on the requirements of a specific organization, along with a number of 'functions' that could be included within each of the major functions. Bates William, p. 1. The article also discusses a "core of project directors or managers who

can be assigned to major projects ... and provide coaching and consulting services to other project managers." Bates William, p. 2. Bates William does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" as recited by Claim 1, nor is Bates William relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore, Claims 9, 13 and 14 are allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 9, 13 and 14 be allowed.

Dependent Claims 10 and 15 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge* ("PMBK"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that dependent Claims 10 and 15 are allowable as depending from independent Claim 1, shown above to be allowable, and as defining further limitations over the cited references of Knudson and PMBK. PMBK discloses that the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) is "an inclusive term that describes the sum of knowledge within the profession of project management... and that [the reference] identifies and describes that subset of the PMBOK which is *generally accepted*." PMBK, p. 2. The reference teaches a number of figures that illustrate overviews of various levels of "Project Management." PMBK, pp. 7, 41, 48, 60, 74, 84, 94, 104, 109, 112, and 124. PMBK does not teach "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" as recited by Claim 1, nor is PMBK relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore, Claims 10 and 15 are allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 10 and 15 be allowed.

Claims 32, 35, 38-40, 42, 60-62 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of PMBK. Of these, Claim 32 is independent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 32 recites, in part, "mapping milestones defined in the at least one project to tactics defined in the program office database for reporting purposes." Applicants note that the Examiner has not cited any teaching in Knudson or PMBK, either alone or in combination, with respect to this limitation. Knudson does not teach or suggest this limitation for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1. As discussed above, PMBK does not teach this limitation, nor is PMBK relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore Claim 32 is allowable over the cited references of Knudson and PMBK, either

alone or in combination for at least these reasons. Thus, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 32.

Dependent Claims 35, 38-40, 42 and 60-62, which depend from independent Claim 32, are patentable over Knudson and PMBK, either alone or in combination, for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 32 and as defining further limitations over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 33 and 59 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of PMBK as applied to Claim 32, and further in view of Bates William. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that dependent Claims 33 and 59 are allowable as depending from independent Claim 32, shown above to be allowable, and as defining further limitations over the cited references of Knudson, PMBK and Bates William. As discussed above, neither Knudson, PMBK nor Bates William, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" as recited by Claim 32, nor are PMBK or Bates William relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore, Claims 33 and 59 are allowable over Knudson, PMBK and Bates William, either alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 33 and 59 be allowed.

Dependent Claim 58 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Knudson as applied to Claim 33 above, and further in view of Gary Hamel. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that dependent Claim 58 is allowable as depending from independent Claim 32 and dependent Claim 33, shown above to be allowable, and as defining further limitations over the cited references of Knudson and Gary Hamel. As discussed above, neither Knudson nor Gary Hamel, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "data associated with translating progress milestones defined in the projects to tactics defined in the system" as recited by Claim 32, nor is Gary Hamel relied on to teach this limitation. Therefore, Claim 58 is allowable over Knudson and Gary Hamel, either alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Claim 58 be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands willing to conduct such a telephone interview at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Matthew B. Talpis
Reg. No. 45,152

Send Correspondence to:

L. Joy Griebenow, Esq.
Electronic Data Systems Corporation
Legal Affairs, MS H3-A-05
5400 Legacy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

Date: November 13, 2000